REMARKS

Claims 29-34 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 29, 30, 33 and 34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Farnham et al. (US 2005/0163070).

Claim 29, as amended, recites the feature of a detector operable to detect, based on said information regarding the receiving condition of the received packets from the terminal, an interval at which an error rate is higher than a specified threshold within said one cycle of said predetermined frequency of said AC power supply, said interval representing a transmission path fluctuation period in which the transmission path is affected by said AC power supply.

Applicants respectfully submit that Farnham does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature recited in claim 29.

With respect to Farnham, Applicants note that this reference discloses a wireless communication system having one or more base stations 2 coupled to a plurality of mobile stations 1 (see Fig. 1 and paragraph [0027]). As shown in Fig. 2a of Farnham, a base station 2a includes a plurality of transceivers 14a-14d for communicating with the mobile stations 1, and transmission management (TM) functions 12a-12d for corresponding ones of the transceivers 14a-14d (see paragraphs [0028] and [0030]).

As explained in Farnham, the TM functions 12a-12d control the transmission power levels of the corresponding transceivers 14a-14d (see paragraph [0030]). For example, Farnham discloses that the TM function 12a for a corresponding transceiver 14a first determines whether

the next packet to be transmitted has a high Quality of Service requirement (QoS), and if the next packet requires a high QoS, then the TM function 12a determines an estimate of the level of interference that the transceiver 14a will be transmitting on for its next transmission period over which the high QoS packet will be transmitted by interrogating the other TM functions 12b-12d about their next transmission slots (see paragraph [0032]).

In this regard, as explained in Farnham, if the TM function 12a determines that the interference will be above a predetermined threshold for a high QoS packet, then the TM function 12a selects an interfering transceiver (i.e., one of transceivers 14b-14d), and requests that the interfering transceiver (i.e., one of transceivers 14b-14d) either reduce its power or suspend transmission during the next transmission slot, so that the transceiver 14a can successfully transmit the high QoS packet during the next transmission slot (see paragraphs [0036] and [0045]).

As further disclosed in Farnham, the base station 2a includes a performance and traffic monitoring function 27a which is able determine parameters such as signal strength, bit error rate, and packet failure (see Fig. 4a and paragraph [0046]). The measurements taken by the performance and traffic monitoring function 27a of Farnham are then utilized to estimate the amount of interference levels for upcoming transmission slots, and to determine whether a high QoS packet can be transmitted by the transceiver 14a during a particular transmission slot (see paragraphs [0046]-[0048]).

In this regard, as explained above, if it is determined that the interference level will be too high during the desired transmission slot for the high QoS packet, a request is sent to one of the interfering transceivers 14b-14d to reduce power or to suspend transmission during the desired

transmission slot for the high QoS packet (see paragraph [0048]). If the request is successful, then the transceiver 14a will transmit the high QoS packet during the desired transmission slot (see paragraph [0048]).

Based on the foregoing description, Applicants note that in Farnham, information is gathered regarding the quality of received signals in order to make a determination as to whether or not a first transceiver 14a will be able to successfully transmit a high QoS signal during a desired transmission slot due to interference from interfering transceivers 14b-14d, and to request one of the interfering transceivers 14b-14d to reduce power output (or suspend transmission) during the desired transmission slot if the interference will be above a certain threshold.

In other words, Applicants note that Farnham is directed to the manner in which the transmission path of the first transceiver 14a will be affected by interference from one or more of the other transceivers 14b-14d. In contrast, Applicants note that claim 29, as amended herein, is directed to the manner in which the transmission path of the terminal will be affected by an AC power supply.

In view of the foregoing differences between Farnham and amended claim 29, Applicants note that while Farnham may disclose the ability to determine whether or not a transmission path for the first transceiver 14a will be affected due to interference from one or more of the other transceivers 14b-14d, that Farnham does not disclose or suggest the above-noted feature recited in amended claim 29 of a detector operable to detect, based on said information regarding the receiving condition of the received packets from the terminal, an interval at which an error rate is higher than a specified threshold within said one cycle of said predetermined frequency of said

AC power supply, said interval representing a transmission path fluctuation period in which the transmission path is affected by said AC power supply.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 29 is patentable over Farnham, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 30 and 33 depend from claim 29 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 34, Applicants note that this claim recites the feature of detecting, based on the information regarding the receiving condition of the received packets from the terminal, an interval at which an error rate is higher than a specified threshold within said one cycle of said predetermined frequency of said AC power supply, said interval representing a transmission path fluctuation period in which the transmission path is affected by said AC power supply.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 29, Applicants respectfully submit that Farnham does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in claim 34. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 34 is patentable over Farnham, an indication of which is kindly requested.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 31 and 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farnham et al. (US 2005/0163070) in view of Fahim (US 7,042,972)

Claims 31 and 32 depend from claim 29. Applicants respectfully submit that Fahim does not cure the deficiencies of Farnham, as discussed above, with respect to claim 29. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 29 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiency in fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 23-0975.

Respectfully submitted,

Shuya HOSOKAWA et al.

/Kenneth W. Fields/
2009.10.14 16:55:08 -04'00'

By: _____
Kenneth W. Fields
Registration No. 52,430
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/krg
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
October 14, 2009